

### **REMARKS**

Claims 18-34 and 39-43 are pending. Claims 21-22 and 35-37 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 23-28 and 33 are amended. Claims 39-42 are added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Final Action based on the following additional remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0231588 to Roth in view of U.S. Patent 5,500,858 to McKeown, as set forth by the Examiner in pages 4-8 of the Final Action.

As previously discussed in the amendment mailed on April 18, 2008, claims 1-16 have been cancelled and new claims have been presented for prosecution. The above claim amendments (e.g., amendments to claims 23-28, 33, and new claims 39-42) are intended to supplement those made previously and are believed to be patentable over Roth and McKeown for at least the reasons discussed below.

For example, it is respectfully submitted that Roth and McKeown, alone, or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *a plurality of allocation stages, a request unit providing requests to transmit data packets from a plurality of devices in parallel to the input of each of the stages, wherein each request includes an output port identifier for transmitting data packets to one of a plurality of output ports, and a grant unit providing final matching information from the allocation stages to the input devices*, as recited in amended claim 25.

Roth merely teaches a source arbiter (27) that receives weights from a subset of input nodes (12) and grants permission to the input node (12) with the highest weight. The weights are not the same as the claimed requests because they do not include an output port identifier.

Further, there is no disclosure in Roth of the source arbiter (27) including a plurality of allocation stages, wherein an output of each stage is connected to an input of a subsequent stage. While Roth teaches a collection of destination arbiters (22) in FIG. 2, there is no disclosure in Roth of the arbiters being daisy chained together. Further, there is no disclosure in Roth of the destination arbiters (22) receiving requests in parallel, much less requests that include output identifiers. The deficiencies of Roth in this regard are not cured by McKeown. For example, McKeown merely teaches (in col. 4, line 63-col.5, line 5) uses a rotating priority scheme that matches inputs to outputs based on the input requests with the highest priority. There is no disclosure in McKeown of the input requests including an output port identifier. Further there is no disclosure in McKeown of a plurality of allocation stages that receive the requests in parallel at their inputs. While McKeown teaches (in FIG. 1) a collection of Scheduler Units 90A-90N, all the requests are not sent in parallel to each of the units. For example, McKeown teaches (in FIG. 1) that a separate request is sent to each unit.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 25 is believed to be patentable over the combination of Roth and McKeown.

Claims 26-34 are believed to be patentable over said combination at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 25.

Newly added claim 39 is at least believed to be patentable over Roth and McKeown for at least similar reasons to claim 25. For example, newly added claim 39 recites, inter alia, *providing a plurality of requests to transmit data packets from a plurality of input ports, wherein each request corresponds to one of the input ports and includes an output port identifier for transmitting data packets to one of a plurality of output ports, and b) receiving the requests in parallel at respective inputs of the allocation stages, one of the allocation stages generating a*

*final matching information based on a preceding intermediate matching information and the requests received.*

Newly added claims 40-43 are believed to be patentable over said combination at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 25.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Dated: 4/25/08

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert J. Newman*

Robert J. Newman

Reg. No. 60,718

F. Chau & Associates, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889